

Remarks

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application. Independent claims 1 and 11 have been amended to more clearly describe the invention. Dependent claims 6 and 16 have also been amended. Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claim 6 because the written portion of the claims seems to be missing or incomplete. Applicant believes claim 6 appears to be complete and is provided for your review.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, and 13

Under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) Over Baker et al.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 11, 12, and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Baker. However, independent claims 1 and 11 been amended to more particularly point out the invention and the Examiner's rejection is no longer valid. However, to the extent that this rejection applies to amended claims 1 and 11, and dependent claims 2, 3, 12, and 13, Applicant submits the following remarks.

Applicant's amended claim 1 includes a method of training a computer system via human voice input from a human teacher. The computer system has a text to speech engine and a speech recognition engine. The computer system presents a text spelling of an unknown word and requests to receive the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word using speech output. The request from the computer system takes a form of an ongoing dialog between the computer system and the human teacher. The computer system then receives a human voice pronunciation of the unknown word from the human teacher. A phonetic spelling of the

unknown word with the speech recognition engine based on the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word. The text spelling is associated with the phonetic spelling to allow the text to speech engine to correctly pronounce the unknown word in the future when presented with the text spelling of the unknown word.

Baker discloses a method of adding a word to a speech recognition vocabulary. The spelling and utterance of the word are received and a collection of possible phonetic pronunciations of the word are created. The collection is created by comparing the spelling to a rules list of letter strings with associated phonemes. Also, speech recognition could be used to find the pronunciation from the net that best matches the utterance of the word.

However, as noted by the Examiner, Baker fails to describe or suggest the computer system presenting the text spelling of an unknown word and requesting to receive the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word, using speech output in the form of an ongoing dialog between the computer system and the human teacher. (see, for example, pages 6-8.) Instead, the Examiner refers to Beutnagel, specifically column 5, lines 35-56, to teach the features not shown in Baker.

Beutnagel discloses a method and system that allows users to add new words or to revise phonetic transcription of words in a phonetic dictionary. Column 5, lines 35-56 merely mentions prompting the end-user to speak a single displayed word and then storing this word in the speech file memory. Applicant contends that Beutnagel fails to describe or suggest using speech output to request receiving human voice pronunciation of an unknown word in the form of ongoing dialog between the computer system and the human teacher, which would provide a more natural conversation flow between the human teacher and the computer system. As such, Beutnagel fails to overcome the deficiencies of Baker to achieve Applicant's claimed invention.

Accordingly, Applicant believes that claim 1, along with dependent claims 2 and 3 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

Claim 11 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons as described above for claim 1. Claims 12 and 13 depend from claim 11 and are also believed to be patentable.

Rejection of claims 4, 5, 14, and 15

Under 135 U.S.C. 103(a) Over Baker et al. in view of Beutnagel

Claims 4, 5, 14, and 15 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baker in view of Beutnagel. These claims have been cancelled, such that this rejection is no longer applicable.

Rejection of claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Over Baker et al. in view of Beutnagel and Hon et al.

Claims 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Baker in view of Beutnagel and further in view of Hon.

Regarding the rejection of claims 6, 7, 16, and 17, these claims are dependent upon claims 1 and 11, respectively, and are also believed to be patentable. These claims further exemplify the ongoing dialog between the computer system and the human teacher required for correct pronunciation in the future when presented with the text spelling of the unknown word.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 8, this claim describes a method of training a computer system via human voice input from a human teacher. The computer system has a speech recognition engine. The method comprises receiving a human voice pronunciation of an unknown word from the human teacher. A phonetic spelling of the unknown word is determined with the speech recognition engine based on the human voice pronunciation of the unknown word. A known word that is related to the meaning of the unknown word is received. The known word is associated with the phonetic spelling of the

unknown word to allow the speech recognition engine to correctly recognize the unknown word in the future as related in meaning to the known word. (see, for example, pages 8-9.)

Hon describes a method for reducing recognition errors in a speech recognition system, which only improves the recognition accuracy of poorly recognized words. This system has an active display of words that best matches the spoken words based on certain criteria such as unigram probability - the probability that a particular word will be spoken by the user into the dictation system (such as plays, played, playing). The user can then edit the poorly recognized words by selecting the correct word from the lexicon or by manually entering the correct word with a keyboard. The method described by Hon assists in spotting new words.

In contrast, Applicant claims a method for training a computer system to associate existing words with new words of similar meaning (such as car and auto). Hon fails to associate the known word with the phonetic spelling of the unknown word to allow the speech recognition engine to correctly recognize the word in the future is related in meaning to the known word. Additionally, the combination of Baker, Beutnagel, and Hon fail to describe or suggest the method claimed by independent claim 8. As such, Applicant contends that claim 8 is patentably distinguishable from the prior art.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 8 and are also believed to be patentable.

Independent claim 18 is believed to be patentable for similar reasons as described above for claim 8.

Additionally, claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18 and is also believed to be patentable.

Conclusion

In summary, Applicant believes that the claims now meet all formal and substantive requirements and that the case is in appropriate condition for allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Eliot M. Case

By Jeremy J. Curcuri
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: 9/28/04

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351